

section of this notice is planned or (2) the activities as described in the Specified Activities section of this notice would not be completed by the time the IHA expires and a Renewal would allow for completion of the activities beyond that described in the Dates and Duration section of this notice, provided all of the following conditions are met:

- A request for renewal is received no later than 60 days prior to the needed Renewal IHA effective date (recognizing that Renewal IHA expiration date cannot extend beyond one year from expiration of the initial IHA);
- The request for renewal must include the following:

(1) An explanation that the activities to be conducted under the requested Renewal IHA are identical to the activities analyzed under the initial IHA, are a subset of the activities, or include changes so minor (*e.g.*, reduction in pile size) that the changes do not affect the previous analyses, mitigation and monitoring requirements, or take estimates (with the exception of reducing the type or amount of take); and

(2) A preliminary monitoring report showing the results of the required monitoring to date and an explanation showing that the monitoring results do not indicate impacts of a scale or nature not previously analyzed or authorized; and

- Upon review of the request for Renewal, the status of the affected species or stocks, and any other pertinent information, NMFS determines that there are no more than minor changes in the activities, the mitigation and monitoring measures will remain the same and appropriate, and the findings in the initial IHA remain valid.

Dated: February 26, 2020.

**Donna S. Wieting,**

*Director, Office of Protected Resources,  
National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. 2020-04280 Filed 3-2-20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-22-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[RTID 0648-XT036]

#### Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Shark Management Measures; 2020 Research Fishery

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** On November 22, 2019, NMFS published a notice inviting qualified commercial shark permit holders to submit applications to participate in the 2020 shark research fishery. The shark research fishery allows for the collection of fishery-dependent data for future stock assessments and cooperative research with commercial fishermen to meet the shark research objectives of the Agency. Every year, the permit terms and permitted activities (*e.g.*, number of hooks and retention limits) specifically authorized for selected participants in the shark research fishery are designated depending on the scientific and research needs of the Agency, as well as the number of NMFS-approved observers available. In order to inform selected participants of this year's specific permit requirements and ensure all terms and conditions of the permit are met, NMFS is holding a mandatory meeting (via conference call) for selected participants. The date and time of that meeting is announced in this notice.

**DATES:** A conference call will be held on March 9, 2020.

**ADDRESSES:** A conference call will be conducted. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for information on how to access the conference call.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Guy DuBeck at (301) 427-8503, or Delisse Ortiz at (240) 681-9037.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Atlantic shark fisheries are managed under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act). The 2006 Consolidated Atlantic Highly Migratory species (HMS) Fishery Management Plan (FMP) is implemented by regulations at 50 CFR part 635.

The final rule for Amendment 2 to the 2006 Consolidated HMS FMP (73 FR 35778, June 24, 2008, corrected at 73 FR 40658, July 15, 2008) established, among other things, a shark research fishery to maintain time-series data for stock assessments and to meet NMFS' research objectives. The shark research fishery gathers important scientific data and allows selected commercial fishermen the opportunity to earn more revenue from selling the sharks caught, including sandbar sharks. Only the commercial shark fishermen selected to participate in the shark research fishery are authorized to land/harvest sandbar sharks subject to the sandbar quota available each year. The 2020 base annual sandbar shark quota is 90.7 mt

dressed weight (dw). The selected shark research fishery participants also may fish using the research large coastal shark (635.27(b)(1)(iii)(B)), small coastal shark (635.27(b)(1)(i)(C) and 635.27(b)(1)(ii)(D)), and pelagic shark quotas (635.27(b)(1)(iii)(D)) subject to the retention limits at 635.24.

On November 22, 2019 (84 FR 64465), NMFS published a notice inviting qualified commercial shark directed and incidental permit holders to submit an application to participate in the 2020 shark research fishery. NMFS received 16 applications and selected 5 participants. In order to inform selected participants of this year's specific permit requirements and to ensure all terms and conditions of the permit are met, per the requirements of § 635.32(f)(4), NMFS is holding a mandatory permit holder meeting via conference call.

#### Conference Call Date, Time, and Dial-In Number

The conference call will be held on March 9, 2020, from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m. (EST). Participants and interested parties should call 888-469-1244 and use the passcode 5585842. This call is mandatory for selected participants. Selected participants who do not attend will not be allowed to participate in the shark research fishery. While the conference call is mandatory for selected participants, other interested parties may call in and listen to the discussion. Selected participants are encouraged to invite their captain, crew, or anyone else who may assist them in meeting the terms and conditions of the shark research fishery permit.

Dated: February 27, 2020.

**Karyl K. Brewster-Geisz,**

*Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. 2020-04324 Filed 3-2-20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-22-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

#### Applications for New Awards; Technical Assistance and Dissemination To Improve Services and Results for Children With Disabilities—Model Demonstration Projects To Develop Coaching Systems

**AGENCY:** Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Education (Department) is issuing a notice inviting applications for new awards for fiscal

year (FY) 2020 for Model Demonstration Projects to Develop Coaching Systems, Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number 84.326M. These projects will provide support to professionals to collaborate with early learning and early intervention programs, schools, districts, and State agencies to establish the infrastructure, personnel skills, and processes necessary for an effective and sustainable coaching system. This notice relates to the approved information collection under OMB control number 1820-0028.

**DATES:**

*Applications Available:* March 3, 2020.

*Deadline for Transmittal of Applications:* May 4, 2020.

*Deadline for Intergovernmental Review:* July 1, 2020.

**ADDRESSES:** For the addresses for obtaining and submitting an application, please refer to our Common Instructions for Applicants to Department of Education Discretionary Grant Programs, published in the **Federal Register** on February 13, 2019 (84 FR 3768), and available at [www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2019-02-13/pdf/2019-02206.pdf](http://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2019-02-13/pdf/2019-02206.pdf).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Jennifer Coffey, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW, Room 5161, Potomac Center Plaza, Washington, DC 20202-5076. Telephone: (202) 245-6673. Email: [Jennifer.Coffey@ed.gov](mailto:Jennifer.Coffey@ed.gov).

If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a text telephone (TTY), call the Federal Relay Service (FRS), toll free, at 1-800-877-8339.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Full Text of Announcement**

**I. Funding Opportunity Description**

*Purpose of Program:* The purpose of the Technical Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities program is to promote academic achievement and to improve results for children with disabilities by providing technical assistance (TA), supporting model demonstration projects, disseminating useful information, and implementing activities that are supported by scientifically based research.

*Priority:* This competition includes one absolute priority, one competitive preference priority, and one invitational priority. In accordance with 34 CFR 75.105(b)(2)(v), the absolute priority and competitive preference priority are from

allowable activities specified in or otherwise authorized in sections 663 and 681(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (20 U.S.C. 1463, 1481(d)).

*Absolute Priority:* For FY 2020 and any subsequent year in which we make awards from the list of unfunded applications from this competition, this priority is an absolute priority. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(3), we consider only applications that meet this priority.

This priority is:

*Model Demonstration Projects to Develop Coaching Systems.*

*Background*

Model demonstrations to improve early intervention, educational, or transitional results for children with disabilities and their families have been authorized under the IDEA since the law's inception. For the purposes of this priority, a model is a set of existing evidence-based practices,<sup>1</sup> including interventions and implementation strategies (*i.e.*, core model components), that research suggests will improve outcomes for children, families, personnel,<sup>2</sup> administrators, or systems, when implemented with fidelity. Model demonstrations involve investigating the degree to which a given model can be implemented and sustained in real-world settings, by staff employed in those settings, while achieving outcomes similar to those attained under research conditions.

Researchers have identified practices that improve academic, functional, developmental, and behavioral outcomes for children with disabilities, yet such evidence-based practices are not implemented or scaled up in a systematic manner to maximize their potential to impact child outcomes (Sanetti & Collier-Meek, 2019). To bridge this research-to-practice gap, the field has responded by developing improved professional development models for supporting the implementation of evidence-based practices.

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this priority, "evidence-based" means the proposed project component is supported by promising evidence, which is evidence of the effectiveness of a key project component in improving a "relevant outcome" (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1), based on a relevant finding from one of the sources identified under "promising evidence" in 34 CFR 77.1.

<sup>2</sup> As defined by section 651(b) of IDEA, the term "personnel" means special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals, administrators, related services personnel, paraprofessionals, and early intervention personnel serving infants, toddlers, preschoolers, or children with disabilities, except where a particular category of personnel, such as related services personnel, is identified.

Coaching has been identified as a key implementation "driver" for implementing evidence-based practices (Metz & Bartley, 2012). Kraft et al.'s (2018) meta-analysis of the causal effects of coaching suggests coaching programs hold real promise for improving instructional practice and, as a result, child outcomes. This meta-analysis also found that virtual coaching can be as effective as in-person coaching and that there are many unknowns related to the amount of coaching needed and strategies that will be most effective.

Various coaching models show promising results for improving instructional practices and child outcomes. Examples of promising models include mentoring (Schmidt et al., 2017), data-driven instructional coaching (Glover et al., 2019), and practice-based coaching (Snyder et al., 2015), among others.

The field has also begun to articulate the challenges and solutions to implementing effective coaching models, specifically the infrastructure needed to support a comprehensive and sustainable coaching system. For example, Kraft et al. (2018) suggest that a primary implementation challenge is building a corps of capable coaches whose expertise is well matched to the diverse needs of the personnel being supported. In addition, the State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practices Technical Assistance Center (SISEP) developed a resource that describes research-based components of coaching (<https://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/resources/coaching-practice-profile>). These findings provide a basis for investing in efforts to expand the existing research base and to learn more about what it takes to scale up and sustain coaching models.

Model demonstration coaching projects could further refine the key components of effective coaching across various models and provide needed data on whether particular approaches to coaching are effective, how to differentiate coaching strategies based on personnel needs, the amount of coaching individuals need to successfully implement an evidence-based practice and how to select coaches.

Model demonstration coaching projects can identify the challenges to implementation and determine system supports to assist in meeting those challenges. Additionally, these model demonstrations can take the first steps to systematically scale up the critical features of effective coaching.

The projects must be awarded and operated in a manner consistent with

nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and the Federal civil rights laws.

#### Priority

The purpose of this priority is to fund three cooperative agreements to establish and operate evidence-based model demonstration projects. The models will implement coaching systems in early intervention, early learning, elementary school, middle school, or high school settings.

The models will address the infrastructure (e.g., implementation teams) and ongoing supports needed to foster the development, implementation, and evaluation of coaches and a coaching system to support personnel who work with children with disabilities.

The models will demonstrate methods for identifying coaching strategies and the necessary intensity and frequency of those strategies to meet the needs of personnel being coached.

The models will capture information about challenges to implementation and determine what system supports may assist in meeting those challenges. Additionally, the models will use coaching data to provide information about how coaching services affect provider services and, accordingly, child outcomes (i.e., connecting coaching fidelity data to intervention fidelity data to child outcome data). The model demonstration projects will assess how models can—

- Support implementation of evidence-based practices that improve outcomes for children with disabilities;
- Improve the capacity of local coaches to support personnel who serve children with disabilities;
- Improve the capacity of sites and the central offices or programs that support them to build infrastructure that supports an effective coaching system; and
- Improve understanding of how State agencies could reduce barriers to, and support, implementation of coaching systems.

Applicants must propose models that meet the following requirements:

- (a) The model's core intervention components must include—
- (1) Coaching services that are supported by evidence;
  - (2) Ongoing measures of coaching supports and the impact of those supports, specifically fidelity measures and child outcomes;<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Applicants must ensure the confidentiality of individual student data, consistent with the Confidentiality of Information regulations under both part B and part C of IDEA, which incorporate

(2) Professional development to support coaches' appropriate and timely use of data to inform the need for differentiating coaching strategies, intensity, and frequency dependent on content and personnel needs;

(3) Procedures to refine the model based on the ongoing measures of fidelity of coaching services, fidelity of the implementation of evidence-based practices, and child outcomes;

(4) Procedures for coaches to share data at the site, central office or program, and State levels so that the data can be used to make decisions regarding, remove barriers to, and support, implementation and sustainability of the coaching system; and

(5) Measures of the model's social validity, i.e., measures of personnel and administrator satisfaction with the model components, processes, and outcomes.

(b) The model's core implementation components must include—

- (1) Criteria and strategies for selecting<sup>4</sup> and recruiting sites and coaches at those sites, including approaches to introducing the model to, and promoting the model among, site participants.<sup>5</sup> Applicants are encouraged to choose sites from a variety of settings (e.g., urban, rural, suburban, type of school such as elementary, charter, or early learning)

requirements and exceptions under section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g), commonly known as the "Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act" (FERPA), but also include several provisions that are specifically related to children with disabilities receiving services under IDEA and provide protections beyond the FERPA regulations. Therefore, examining the IDEA requirements first is the most effective and efficient way to meet the requirements of both IDEA and FERPA for children with disabilities. Applicants should also be aware of State laws or regulations concerning the confidentiality of individual records. See [www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/ptac/pdf/idea-ferpa.pdf](http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/ptac/pdf/idea-ferpa.pdf) and [studentprivacy.ed.gov/resources/ferpaidea-cross-walk](http://studentprivacy.ed.gov/resources/ferpaidea-cross-walk). Final FERPA regulatory changes became effective January 3, 2012, and include requirements for data sharing. Applicants are encouraged to review the final FERPA regulations published on December 2, 2011 (76 FR 75604). Questions can be directed to the Student Privacy Policy Office (SPPO) (<https://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/index.html>) at 1-800-USA-LEARN (1-800-872-5327) or <https://studentprivacy.ed.gov/contact>.

<sup>4</sup> For factors to consider when selecting model demonstration sites, the applicant should refer to *Assessing Sites for Model Demonstration: Lessons Learned for OSEP Grantees* at [mdcc.sri.com/documents/MDCC\\_Site\\_Assessment\\_Brief\\_09-30-11.pdf](http://mdcc.sri.com/documents/MDCC_Site_Assessment_Brief_09-30-11.pdf). The document also contains a site assessment tool.

<sup>5</sup> For factors to consider when preparing for model demonstration implementation, the applicant should refer to *Preparing for Model Demonstration Implementation* at [mdcc.sri.com/documents/MDCC\\_PreparationStage\\_Brief\\_Apr2013.pdf](http://mdcc.sri.com/documents/MDCC_PreparationStage_Brief_Apr2013.pdf).

and populations (e.g., concentration of students receiving free or reduced-price lunch);

(2) A lag site implementation design, which allows for model development and refinement at the first site in year one of the project period, with sites two and three implementing a revised model based on data from the first site beginning in subsequent project years;

(3) A professional development component that includes a strategy to work with administrators and coaches, to enable site-based personnel to implement the coaching model with fidelity; and

(4) Measures of the results of the professional development required by paragraph (b)(3) of this section.

(c) The core strategies for sustaining the model must include—

(1) Documentation that permits current and future site-based staff to replicate or appropriately tailor and sustain the model at any site;<sup>6</sup>

(2) Guidelines and procedures to—

- (i) Help administrators support a coaching system;
- (ii) Provide professional development to coaches;
- (iii) Collect data on fidelity of coaching services and impact of coaching on intervention fidelity;
- (iv) Match coaching strategies and intensity of the strategies based on content and personnel need;
- (v) Determine the amount and frequency of coaching needed to improve intervention fidelity; and
- (vi) Collect data regarding the connection among coaching strategies used, the frequency and amount of coaching, and the fidelity of the implementation of the model coaching system and child outcomes and communicate regularly about the data at the local, regional (as appropriate), and State levels;

(3) Strategies for the grantee to disseminate or promote the use of the model, such as developing easily accessible online training materials, coordinating with TA providers who might serve as future trainers, or providing technical support (e.g., webinars, training sessions, or workshops) for users who may want to learn about and implement the model and its components; and

(4) Strategies for the grantee to assist State agencies (e.g., State educational agencies (SEAs) and State lead agencies

<sup>6</sup> For a guide on documenting model demonstration sustainment and replication, the applicant should refer to *Planning for Replication and Dissemination From the Start: Guidelines for Model Demonstration Projects (Revised)* at [mdcc.sri.com/documents/MDCC\\_ReplicationBrief\\_SEP2015.pdf](http://mdcc.sri.com/documents/MDCC_ReplicationBrief_SEP2015.pdf).

(SLAs) and local early learning or early intervention agencies and local educational agencies (LEAs)) within the State to scale up a model and its components.

To be considered for funding under this absolute priority, applicants must meet the application requirements contained in this priority. Each project funded under this absolute priority also must meet the programmatic and administrative requirements specified in the priority.

#### *Application Requirements*

An applicant must include in its application—

(a) A detailed review of the literature addressing the proposed evidence-based model or its implementation components and the proposed processes to improve coaching services for personnel who serve children with disabilities;

(b) A logic model<sup>7</sup> that depicts, at a minimum, the goals, activities, outputs, and outcomes (described in paragraph (a) under the heading *Priority*) of the proposed model demonstration project.

*Note:* The following websites provide resources for constructing logic models: [www.osepideasthatwork.org/logicModel](http://www.osepideasthatwork.org/logicModel) and [www.osepideasthatwork.org/resources-grantees/program-areas/ta-ta-tad-project-logic-model-and-conceptual-framework](http://www.osepideasthatwork.org/resources-grantees/program-areas/ta-ta-tad-project-logic-model-and-conceptual-framework);

(c) A description of the activities and measures to be incorporated into the proposed model demonstration project (*i.e.*, the project design) to develop coaching systems, including a timeline of how and when the components are introduced within the model. A detailed and complete description must include the following:

(1) Each of the coaching system components.

(2) The existing and proposed measures of fidelity of coaching services, fidelity of the implementation of evidence-based practices, and child outcomes, as well as social validity measures. The measures should be described as completely as possible, referenced as appropriate, and included, when available, in Appendix A.

(3) Each of the implementation components, including, at a minimum, those listed under paragraph (b) under the heading *Priority*. The existing or proposed implementation fidelity

measures, including those measuring the fidelity of the professional development strategy, should be described as completely as possible, referenced as appropriate, and included, when available, in Appendix A. In addition, this description should include—

(i) Demographics, including, at a minimum, the settings of, and children participating in, all of the implementation sites that have been identified and successfully recruited for the purposes of this application using the selection and recruitment strategies described in paragraph (b)(1) under the heading *Priority*;

*Note:* Applicants are encouraged to identify, to the extent possible, the sites willing to participate in the applicant's model demonstration. Final site selection will be determined in consultation with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) project officer following the kick-off meeting described in paragraph (e)(1) of these application requirements, and if the project is working with elementary, middle, or high school sites, the final sites will include at least one school of choice such as a public magnet, public charter, or private school; and

(ii) The lag site implementation design for implementation consistent with the requirements in paragraph (b)(2) under the heading *Priority*.

(4) Each of the strategies to promote sustaining and replicating the model, including, at a minimum, those listed under paragraph (c) under the heading *Priority*.

(d) A description of the evaluation activities and measures to be incorporated into the proposed model demonstration project. A detailed and complete description must include—

(1) A formative evaluation plan, consistent with the project's logic model, that includes evaluation questions, sources of data, a timeline for data collection, and analysis plans. The plan must show how the outcome data (*e.g.*, child, personnel, or systems measures, social validity) and implementation data (*e.g.*, fidelity, effectiveness of professional development activities) will be used separately or in combination to improve the project during the performance period. These data will be reported in the annual performance report (APR). The plan also must outline how these data will be reviewed by project staff, when they will be reviewed, and how they will be used during the course of the project to adjust the model or its implementation to increase the model's usefulness, generalizability, and potential for sustainability; and

(2) A summative evaluation plan, including a timeline, to collect and analyze data on changes to child, teacher, service provider, or system outcomes over time or relative to comparison groups that can be reasonably attributable to project activities. The plan must show how the child, personnel, or system outcome and implementation data collected by the project will be used separately or in combination to demonstrate the promise of the model.

(e) A budget for attendance at the following:

(1) A one and one-half day kick-off meeting to be held in Washington, DC, after receipt of the award.

(2) A three-day project directors' conference in Washington, DC, occurring twice during the project performance period.

(3) Four travel days spread across years two through four of the project period to attend planning meetings, Department briefings, Department-sponsored conferences, and other meetings, as requested by OSEP, to be held in Washington, DC.

#### *Other Project Activities*

To meet the requirements of this priority, each project, at a minimum, must—

(a) Communicate and collaborate on an ongoing basis with other Department-funded projects, including, at a minimum, OSEP-funded TA centers that might disseminate information on the model or support the scale-up efforts of a model based on promising evidence;

(b) Maintain ongoing telephone and email communication with the OSEP project officer and the other model demonstration projects funded under this priority;

(c) If the project maintains a website, include relevant information about the model, the intervention, and the demonstration activities and ensure that the website meets government- or industry-recognized standards for accessibility; and

(d) Ensure that annual progress toward meeting project goals is posted on the project website.

*Competitive Preference Priority:* Within this absolute priority, we give competitive preference to applications that address the following competitive preference priority. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(i), we award an additional 5 points to an application that meets the competitive preference priority. This priority is:

*Competitive Preference Priority 1 (0 or 5 points).* Projects proposed by applicants that have not had an active grant award under the Technical

<sup>7</sup> *Logic model* (also referred to as a theory of action) means a framework that identifies key project components of the proposed project (*i.e.*, the active "ingredients" that are hypothesized to be critical to achieving the relevant outcomes) and describes the theoretical and operational relationships among the key project components and relevant outcomes.

Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children model demonstration grants (84.326M) at any point in the preceding five fiscal years (*i.e.*, FY 2015–FY 2019).

*Note:* If an applicant has previously received a grant under the 84.326M program, the performance period for that grant must have ended on or before September 30, 2014 in order to receive points under this priority.

*Invitational Priority:* For FY 2020 and any subsequent year in which we make awards from the list of unfunded applications from this competition, this priority is an invitational priority. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(1), we do not give an application that meets this invitational priority a competitive or absolute preference over other applications. This priority is:

Projects that include a virtual delivery method within their coaching system.

#### References

- Glover, T. A., Reddy, L. A., Kurz, A., & Elliott, S. N. (2019). Use of an online platform to facilitate and investigate data-driven instructional coaching. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 44(2), 95–103.
- Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 88(4), 547–588.
- Metz, A., & Bartley, L. (2012). Active implementation frameworks for program success. *Zero to Three*, 32(4), 11–18.
- Sanetti, L. M. H., & Collier-Meek, M. A. (2019). Increasing implementation science literacy to address the research-to-practice gap in school psychology. *Journal of School Psychology*, 76, 33–47.
- Schmidt, R., Young, V., Cassidy, L., Wang, H., & Laguarda, K. (2017). *Impact of the New Teacher Center's new teacher induction model on teachers and students*. SRI International.
- Snyder, P. A., Hemmeter, M. L., & Fox, L. (2015). Supporting implementation of evidence-based practices through practice-based coaching. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 35(3), 133–143.

#### Waiver of Proposed Rulemaking:

Under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 553) the Department generally offers interested parties the opportunity to comment on proposed priorities and other requirements. Section 681(d) of IDEA, however, makes the public comment requirements of the APA inapplicable to the absolute priority and related definitions in this notice.

*Program Authority:* 20 U.S.C. 1463 and 1481.

*Applicable Regulations:* (a) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations in 34 CFR parts 75, 77, 79, 81, 82, 84, 86, 97, 98,

and 99. (b) The Office of Management and Budget Guidelines to Agencies on Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) in 2 CFR part 180, as adopted and amended as regulations of the Department in 2 CFR part 3485. (c) The Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards in 2 CFR part 200, as adopted and amended as regulations of the Department in 2 CFR part 3474.

*Note:* The regulations in 34 CFR part 79 apply to all applicants except federally recognized Indian Tribes.

*Note:* The regulations in 34 CFR part 86 apply to institutions of higher education (IHEs) only.

#### II. Award Information

*Type of Award:* Cooperative agreements.

*Estimated Available Funds:* \$1,200,000.

Contingent upon the availability of funds and the quality of applications, we may make additional awards in FY 2021 from the list of unfunded applications from this competition.

*Estimated Range of Awards:* \$375,000 to \$400,000 per year.

*Estimated Average Size of Awards:* \$400,000 per year.

*Maximum Award:* We will not make an award exceeding \$400,000 for a single budget period of 12 months.

*Estimated Number of Awards:* 3.

*Note:* The Department is not bound by any estimates in this notice.

*Project Period:* Up to 48 months.

#### III. Eligibility Information

1. *Eligible Applicants:* SEAs; LEAs, including charter schools that are considered LEAs under State law; IHEs; other public agencies; private nonprofit organizations; outlying areas; freely associated States; Indian Tribes or Tribal organizations; and for-profit organizations.

2. *Cost Sharing or Matching:* This program does not require cost sharing or matching.

3. *Subgrantees:* A grantee under this competition may not award subgrants to entities to directly carry out project activities described in its application. Under 34 CFR 75.708(e), a grantee may contract for supplies, equipment, and other services in accordance with 2 CFR part 200.

4. *Other General Requirements:*

(a) Recipients of funding under this competition must make positive efforts to employ and advance in employment qualified individuals with disabilities (see section 606 of IDEA).

(b) Applicants for, and recipients of, funding must, with respect to the

aspects of their proposed project relating to the absolute priority, involve individuals with disabilities, or parents of individuals with disabilities ages birth through 26, in planning, implementing, and evaluating the project (see section 682(a)(1)(A) of IDEA).

#### IV. Application and Submission Information

##### 1. Application Submission

*Instructions:* Applicants are required to follow the Common Instructions for Applicants to Department of Education Discretionary Grant Programs, published in the **Federal Register** on February 13, 2019 (84 FR 3768), and available at [www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2019-02-13/pdf/2019-02206.pdf](http://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2019-02-13/pdf/2019-02206.pdf), which contain requirements and information on how to submit an application.

2. *Intergovernmental Review:* This competition is subject to Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79. Information about Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs under Executive Order 12372 is in the application package for this competition.

3. *Funding Restrictions:* We reference regulations outlining funding restrictions in the *Applicable Regulations* section of this notice.

4. *Recommended Page Limit:* The application narrative (Part III of the application) is where you, the applicant, address the selection criteria that reviewers use to evaluate your application. We recommend that you (1) limit the application narrative to no more than 50 pages and (2) use the following standards:

- A “page” is 8.5” x 11”, on one side only, with 1” margins at the top, bottom, and both sides.

- Double-space (no more than three lines per vertical inch) all text in the application narrative, including titles, headings, footnotes, quotations, reference citations, and captions, as well as all text in charts, tables, figures, graphs, and screen shots.

- Use a font that is 12 point or larger.

- Use one of the following fonts: Times New Roman, Courier, Courier New, or Arial.

The recommended page limit does not apply to Part I, the cover sheet; Part II, the budget section, including the narrative budget justification; Part IV, the assurances and certifications; or the abstract (follow the guidance provided in the application package for completing the abstract), the table of contents, the list of priority requirements, the resumes, the reference list, the letters of support, or the

appendices. However, the recommended page limit does apply to all of the application narrative, including all text in charts, tables, figures, graphs, and screen shots.

## V. Application Review Information

1. *Selection Criteria:* The selection criteria for this competition are from 34 CFR 75.210 and are as follows:

(a) *Significance (15 points).*

(1) The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project.

(2) In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies;

(ii) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population;

(iii) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement; and

(iv) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

(b) *Quality of the project design (35 points).*

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.

(2) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable;

(ii) The extent to which the design of the proposed project includes a thorough, high-quality review of the relevant literature, a high-quality plan for project implementation, and the use of appropriate methodological tools to ensure successful achievement of project objectives;

(iii) The quality of the proposed demonstration design and procedures for documenting project activities and results;

(iv) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project; and

(v) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement are integral to the design of the proposed project.

(c) *Adequacy of resources and quality of the management plan (25 points).*

(1) The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.

(2) In determining the adequacy of resources and the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization;

(ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project;

(iii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project;

(iv) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate;

(v) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks; and

(vi) The adequacy of mechanisms for ensuring high-quality products and services from the proposed project.

(d) *Quality of the project evaluation (25 points).*

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project.

(2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project;

(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes;

(iii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the

effectiveness of project implementation strategies;

(iv) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings; and

(v) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

2. *Review and Selection Process:* We remind potential applicants that in reviewing applications in any discretionary grant competition, the Secretary may consider, under 34 CFR 75.217(d)(3), the past performance of the applicant in carrying out a previous award, such as the applicant's use of funds, achievement of project objectives, and compliance with grant conditions. The Secretary may also consider whether the applicant failed to submit a timely performance report or submitted a report of unacceptable quality.

In addition, in making a competitive grant award, the Secretary requires various assurances, including those applicable to Federal civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance from the Department (34 CFR 100.4, 104.5, 106.4, 108.8, and 110.23).

3. *Additional Review and Selection Process Factors:* In the past, the Department has had difficulty finding peer reviewers for certain competitions because so many individuals who are eligible to serve as peer reviewers have conflicts of interest. The standing panel requirements under section 682(b) of IDEA also have placed additional constraints on the availability of reviewers. Therefore, the Department has determined that for some discretionary grant competitions, applications may be separated into two or more groups and ranked and selected for funding within specific groups. This procedure will make it easier for the Department to find peer reviewers by ensuring that greater numbers of individuals who are eligible to serve as reviewers for any particular group of applicants will not have conflicts of interest. It also will increase the quality, independence, and fairness of the review process, while permitting panel members to review applications under discretionary grant competitions for which they also have submitted applications.

4. *Risk Assessment and Specific Conditions:* Consistent with 2 CFR 200.205, before awarding grants under

this competition the Department conducts a review of the risks posed by applicants. Under 2 CFR 3474.10, the Secretary may impose specific conditions and, in appropriate circumstances, high-risk conditions on a grant if the applicant or grantee is not financially stable; has a history of unsatisfactory performance; has a financial or other management system that does not meet the standards in 2 CFR part 200, subpart D; has not fulfilled the conditions of a prior grant; or is otherwise not responsible.

5. *Integrity and Performance System:* If you are selected under this competition to receive an award that over the course of the project period may exceed the simplified acquisition threshold (currently \$250,000), under 2 CFR 200.205(a)(2) we must make a judgment about your integrity, business ethics, and record of performance under Federal awards—that is, the risk posed by you as an applicant—before we make an award. In doing so, we must consider any information about you that is in the integrity and performance system (currently referred to as the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS)), accessible through the System for Award Management. You may review and comment on any information about yourself that a Federal agency previously entered and that is currently in FAPIIS.

Please note that, if the total value of your currently active grants, cooperative agreements, and procurement contracts from the Federal Government exceeds \$10,000,000, the reporting requirements in 2 CFR part 200, Appendix XII, require you to report certain integrity information to FAPIIS semiannually. Please review the requirements in 2 CFR part 200, Appendix XII, if this grant plus all the other Federal funds you receive exceed \$10,000,000.

## VI. Award Administration Information

1. *Award Notices:* If your application is successful, we notify your U.S. Representative and U.S. Senators and send you a Grant Award Notification (GAN); or we may send you an email containing a link to access an electronic version of your GAN. We may notify you informally, also.

If your application is not evaluated or not selected for funding, we notify you.

2. *Administrative and National Policy Requirements:* We identify administrative and national policy requirements in the application package and reference these and other requirements in the *Applicable Regulations* section of this notice.

We reference the regulations outlining the terms and conditions of an award in the *Applicable Regulations* section of this notice and include these and other specific conditions in the GAN. The GAN also incorporates your approved application as part of your binding commitments under the grant.

3. *Open Licensing Requirements:* Unless an exception applies, if you are awarded a grant under this competition, you will be required to openly license to the public grant deliverables created in whole, or in part, with Department grant funds. When the deliverable consists of modifications to pre-existing works, the license extends only to those modifications that can be separately identified and only to the extent that open licensing is permitted under the terms of any licenses or other legal restrictions on the use of pre-existing works. Additionally, a grantee that is awarded competitive grant funds must have a plan to disseminate these public grant deliverables. This dissemination plan can be developed and submitted after your application has been reviewed and selected for funding. For additional information on the open licensing requirements please refer to 2 CFR 3474.20.

4. *Reporting:* (a) If you apply for a grant under this competition, you must ensure that you have in place the necessary processes and systems to comply with the reporting requirements in 2 CFR part 170 should you receive funding under the competition. This does not apply if you have an exception under 2 CFR 170.110(b).

(b) At the end of your project period, you must submit a final performance report, including financial information, as directed by the Secretary. If you receive a multiyear award, you must submit an annual performance report that provides the most current performance and financial expenditure information as directed by the Secretary under 34 CFR 75.118. The Secretary may also require more frequent performance reports under 34 CFR 75.720(c). For specific requirements on reporting, please go to [www.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/appforms/appforms.html](http://www.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/appforms/appforms.html).

(c) Under 34 CFR 75.250(b), the Secretary may provide a grantee with additional funding for data collection, analysis, and reporting. In this case the Secretary establishes a data collection period.

5. *Performance Measures:* Under the Government Performance Results Modernization Act of 2010, the Department has established a set of performance measures, including long-term measures, that are designed to

yield information on various aspects of the effectiveness and quality of the Model Demonstration Projects to Develop Coaching Systems under the Technical Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children With Disabilities program. These measures are—

- *Current Program Performance Measure:* The percentage of effective evidence-based program models developed by model demonstration projects that are promoted to States and their partners through the Technical Assistance and Dissemination Network; and

- *Pilot Program Performance Measure:* The percentage of effective program models developed by model demonstration projects that are sustained beyond the life of the model demonstration project.

The current program performance measure and the pilot program performance measure apply to projects funded under this competition, and grantees are required to submit data on these measures as directed by OSEP.

Grantees will be required to report information on their project's performance in annual and final performance reports to the Department (34 CFR 75.590).

6. *Continuation Awards:* In making a continuation award under 34 CFR 75.253, the Secretary considers, among other things: Whether a grantee has made substantial progress in achieving the goals and objectives of the project; whether the grantee has expended funds in a manner that is consistent with its approved application and budget; and, if the Secretary has established performance measurement requirements, the performance targets in the grantee's approved application.

In making a continuation award, the Secretary also considers whether the grantee is operating in compliance with the assurances in its approved application, including those applicable to Federal civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance from the Department (34 CFR 100.4, 104.5, 106.4, 108.8, and 110.23).

## VII. Other Information

*Accessible Format:* Individuals with disabilities can obtain this document and a copy of the application package in an accessible format (e.g., braille, large print, audiotape, or compact disc) on request to the program contact person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

*Electronic Access to This Document:* The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal**

**Register.** You may access the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations at [www.govinfo.gov](http://www.govinfo.gov). At this site you can view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Portable Document Format (PDF). To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at the site.

You may also access documents of the Department published in the **Federal Register** by using the article search feature at [www.federalregister.gov](http://www.federalregister.gov). Specifically, through the advanced search feature at this site, you can limit your search to documents published by the Department.

**Mark Schultz,**

*Delegated the authority to perform the functions and duties of the Assistant Secretary for the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.*

[FR Doc. 2020-04316 Filed 3-2-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

**Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

[Docket No. CP20-12-000]

**Columbia Gas Transmission, LLC; Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Leach XPress Project Amendment and Request for Comments on Environmental Issues**

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) will prepare an environmental assessment (EA) that will discuss the environmental impacts of Columbia Gas Transmission, LLC's (Columbia Gas) request for authorization to amend its certificate of public convenience and necessity granted by the Commission in the Order Issuing Certificates and Approving Abandonment (Order) issued on January 19, 2017 in Docket No. CP15-514-000 for the Leach XPress Project.

The amendment would involve the current and future operation of the Ceredo and Crawford Compressor Stations in Wayne County, West Virginia and Fairfield County, Ohio, respectively. The Commission will use this EA in its decision-making process to determine whether the amendment is in the public convenience and necessity.

This notice announces the opening of the scoping process the Commission will use to gather input from the public

and interested agencies about issues regarding the amendment. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Commission to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from its action whenever it considers the issuance of an authorization. NEPA also requires the Commission to discover concerns the public may have about proposals. This process is referred to as "scoping." The main goal of the scoping process is to focus the analysis in the EA on the important environmental issues. By this notice, the Commission requests public comments on the scope of issues to address in the EA. To ensure that your comments are timely and properly recorded, please submit your comments so that the Commission receives them in Washington, DC on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on Friday, March 27, 2020.

You can make a difference by submitting your specific comments or concerns about the amendment. Your comments should focus on the potential operational impacts from the amendment. Your input will help the Commission staff determine what issues they need to evaluate in the EA. Commission staff will consider all filed comments during the preparation of the EA.

This notice is being sent to the Commission's current environmental mailing list for the amendment. State and local government representatives should notify their constituents of this proposed amendment and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern.

**Public Participation**

The Commission offers a free service called eSubscription which makes it easy to stay informed of all issuances and submittals regarding the dockets/projects to which you subscribe. These instant email notifications are the fastest way to receive notification and provide a link to the document files which can reduce the amount of time you spend researching proceedings. To sign up go to [www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/esubscription.asp](http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/esubscription.asp).

For your convenience, there are three methods you can use to submit your comments to the Commission. The Commission encourages electronic filing of comments and has staff available to assist you at (866) 208-3676 or [FercOnlineSupport@ferc.gov](mailto:FercOnlineSupport@ferc.gov). Please carefully follow these instructions so that your comments are properly recorded.

(1) You can file your comments electronically using the *eComment* feature, which is located on the

Commission's website ([www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov)) under the link to *Documents and Filings*. Using eComment is an easy method for submitting brief, text-only comments on a project;

(2) You can file your comments electronically by using the *eFiling* feature, which is located on the Commission's website ([www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov)) under the link to *Documents and Filings*. With eFiling, you can provide comments in a variety of formats by attaching them as a file with your submission. New eFiling users must first create an account by clicking on *eRegister*. You will be asked to select the type of filing you are making; a comment on a particular project is considered a "Comment on a Filing"; or

(3) You can file a paper copy of your comments by mailing them to the following address. Be sure to reference the amendment docket number (CP20-12-000) with your submission: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE, Room 1A, Washington, DC 20426

**Summary of the Proposed Amendment**

Columbia Gas's proposed amendment would modify the Order's noise level requirement, environmental condition 31, for the Ceredo and Crawford Compressor Stations. Since issuance of the Leach XPress Project Order, Columbia Gas has implemented several mitigation measures to reduce the noise levels at the nearest noise sensitive areas surrounding the Ceredo Compressor Station, and it claims that it is infeasible to further mitigate noise levels at this station at the current level of full-load operations. Columbia Gas did not install and was not authorized to install any modified compressor units at the Crawford Compressor Station, and it has confirmed that noise levels at the Crawford Compressor Station have not increased above the pre-existing noise levels since issuance of the Leach XPress Project Order.

Columbia Gas's proposed amendment would restrict any noise level increases at both stations and would slightly reduce the current noise levels at the Ceredo Compressor Station, as noted below. Columbia Gas's requested amendment, however, would modify the noise level restriction required by environmental condition 31 of the Leach XPress Project Order that currently requires it to ensure that noise levels do not exceed an day-night sound level of 55 decibels on the A-weighted scale at the nearest noise sensitive areas. Columbia Gas requests that the Commission modify environmental condition 31 to ensure that the noise